<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-24 are all the claims pending in the application.

In response to the Response filed October 14, 2003, the Examiner removed all of the previous claim rejections.

Now, claims 7-10, 17-20, 23 and 24 are allowed.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by newlycited Roylance et al. (US 6,390,579; hereafter "Roylance").

Claims 2-6, 12-16, 21 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant submits that Roylance fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 11. Specifically, Roylance does not disclose a pulse width modulating signal output device which makes a pulse of a pulse width modulating signal rise synchronously with one of the first clock signal and the processing clock signal generated by an operation device, and makes the pulse of the pulse width modulating signal fall synchronously with a remaining one of the first clock signal and the processing clock signal generated by the operation device, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner asserts that Roylance discloses the claimed pulse width modulating signal output device of claim 1, but Applicant disagrees.

With regard to the limitations of claims 1 and 11, the Examiner refers to col. 4, lines 4-55; col. 11, lines 48-65; and col. 16, lines 25-55. Applicant submits that none of these excerpts disclose the specific features of the claimed pulse width modulating signal output device of claim 1. The reference discloses that several independent clocks are generated and, as noted by the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 U. S. Application No. 09/556,821

Examiner, each clock's rising edge occurs at a time that linearly progresses across the period.

See col. 4, lines 3-10. However, the reference does not disclose that the pulse width modulating

signal output device makes a pulse of a pulse width modulating signal rise synchronously with

one of the first clock signal and the processing clock signal generated by the operation device,

and makes the pulse of the pulse width modulating signal fall synchronously with a remaining

one of the first clock signal and the processing clock signal generated by the operation device.

Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Roylance.

Further, Applicant submits that claim 11 is not anticipated for reasons analogous to those

presented above for claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Cameron W. Beddard

Registration No. 46,545

Date: April 12, 2004

3